

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268

2011 NOV 22 P 1:59

In the Matter of:

LODI, TX 75564
Post Office State ZIP Code

POSTAL REGULATORY
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Docket No: A2012-26

TAMMY CORNETT, Petitioner(s)

Postal Regulatory Commission
Office of the Chief Admin. Officer

NOV 22 2011

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT

1. Petitioner(s) are appealing the Postal Service's Final Determination concerning the LODI, TX post office. The Final Determination was posted 9-26-11.
(date)

2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)(5), the Petitioner(s) request the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the Postal Service's determination on the basis of the record before the Postal Service in the making of the determination.

3. Petitioners: Please set out below the reasons why you believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration. (See pages of the Instructions for an outline of the kinds of reasons the law requires us to consider.) Please be as specific as possible. Please continue on additional paper if you need more space and attach the additional page(s) to this form.

Statement Attached
Pages 1-17

URGENT!!

**Office of the Secretary
Postal Regulatory Commission
901 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20268**

**Allison Rizan
Dallas PFC P.O. Review Coordinator
951 W. Bethel Road
Coppell, TX 75099-9331**

**Frank Richards
Manager, Post Office Operations
951 W. Bethel Road
Coppell, TX 75099-9331**

**Victor Benavides
District Manager, Dallas PCF
951 Bethel Road
Coppell, TX 75099-9331**

**U. S. Congressman
Louis Gohmert
2440 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3035
(202) 226-1230 Fax**

**Tyler Office:
1121 ESE Loop 323, Suite 206
Tyler, TX 75701
(903) 561-6346
(903) 561-6349 F**

URGENT!!

You have posted my personal information on your website for all the world to see. I do not know who should have been responsible to redact this particular information but it was not done.

Reference Item Number 28, Page Number 2.

I request this particular information be removed immediately for privacy reason and identity theft protection.

I would think the USPS is responsible for this but nevertheless it needs to be handled immediately.

A very concerned voting citizen.

**Tammy Cornett
P O Box 27
Lodi, TX 75564**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tammy Cornett". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

A2012-26

A 2012-26

A 2012-26

Frank: Glad that's over

Allison: Held meeting - check that off our list

Frank: I hate those meetings, just the same ole stuff

Allison: They really think they can save their post office
We've got'em in the crosshairs now

Frank: And having to act like we care, who's next on the list

This is a feeble attempt at humor but likely closer to the truth than any thought or emotion on behalf of the principals. It's just a job and they get bonuses under "pay for performance". They don't get paid to care, they get paid to perform.

Also available on web are the Post Office Manuals. I have a section titled
123 Post Offices, Stations, Branches, Contract Postal Units.....

This is their manual for closing procedures. I will raise issues in which I refer to sections of their own manual.

Section 123.622 addresses zip code assignment. They plan on changing our zip code. They state that a zip code may be changed, if the responsible district manager submit's a request with justification to the appropriate vice president, Area Operations, before the proposal to discontinue the Post Office is posted. I can find no record of this request to change our zip code. I have a copy of our Final Determination to Close..... that is signed by Dean J Granholm, Vice President of Delivery and Post Office Operations. It states that they will change our zip code, but there is not a copy of the request from Frank Richards to the vice president with the justification for this change. And in our unique situation, being a two county community, Frank Richards would have had to request two changes. He would have had to request the Jefferson zip code for the Marion County residents and the Bivins zip code for the Cass County residents. Maybe you only put in the record what you want to put in, maybe Frank Richards forgot to submit the request "before" the proposal to discontinue the Post Office was posted.(09/26/2011) Very likely it hasn't even been done yet. If you look under Item Nbr: 23, Page Nbr: 2, concern #2 - the response indicates that it was known that both zip codes would be necessary to continue our service.

Section 123.631 (a.) states that the district manager "Must use the standards and procedures in 123.63 and 123.64 (b.) Must investigate the situation if he/she believes that discontinuance of a Post Office within his/her responsibility may be warranted.

Under 123.633 Views of Postmasters

This section states that Frank Richards must discuss the matter with the postmaster(or OIC) of the office being considered and the postmaster of any

A 2012-26

other offices affected by the change. Frank Richards should make sure these officials submit written comments and suggestions as part of the record when the proposal is reviewed. In our situation this would include Lodi, Jefferson, Kildare, and Bivins Post Offices. There is no indication in the record that this was ever done, therefore it was never done. This is one of the standards in 123.63 that Frank Richards "must" use but failed to. It would also be part of the investigation that Frank Richards "must" perform. Therefore Frank Richards has failed to adhere to his own guidelines in things he "must" do. As far as I know, "must" means required, absolutely, it is your duty, not optional..... Someone needs to tell Frank Richards this. They barely got started and already they are breaking their own rules and doing things their own way. Does that show you how much concern they have for the citizens of Lodi?

Section 123.644 Record

(a.) No information or views submitted by customers may be excluded.

In going through the questionnaires it is obvious that there are missing pages. It was a two page item, our names on the bottom of the second page. In order for Frank Richards to issue a response to a specific individual, he had to have the second page. Yet there are responses to individuals where the second page is missing. And there are responses to individuals where their first page is not included. There are numerous examples of this. I believe that they think no one is looking. They really could care less. This is just one more thing on the checklist, heading down the road to closure of "our" post office. Even if the pages were left blank they should be included in the record to show that they were blank. At best this should be considered sloppy, intentional or not. I think it is a violation of our right to be heard and included in the record. By the way, I sent in my response and none of it is included in the record. Lost in the mail??????

(c.) The record must include a chronological index.....

I have copies of the Official Record. It includes an index but no chronological identification. Low and behold, I glanced at the Official Record submitted on 11/4/2011 to the PRC and it has changed. The record submitted to the PRC has chronology. I was not aware that the "official record" could change. I have only a land line computer hook-up so my capabilities are severely limited. But with a little effort I discovered other documents in the submitted official record that are different from my original official record. One in particular is the "rural route cost analysis form". They have changed everything on this form. My form in the official record shows 41 boxes, at 7.5 miles additional, all 41 boxes are regular Non-L route boxes, at total cost of \$7,633.27. The new form that is part of the PRC official record shows 64 boxes, at 3miles additional, all 64 are centralized

A2012-26

boxes, at total cost of \$6,407.37.

I think, this is very interesting.....so I looked at the Post Office Survey Sheet, identified as Page Nbr: 15 , Page Nbr: 2. That too had been changed. Under #11 the original states: NONE. The PRC submitted record states: Parking lot of the current Post Office and. I suppose they were going to add something else after "and" but forgot. On this same form they also changed 13. © to reflect the new box number and additional miles. They changed 13. (e) to reflect the one-time cost of \$4,000. But they failed to change 13. (d) from \$7,633. The new number \$6,407 should have been in that slot. If they are going to alter "official records" they should be more thorough.

Well, this is news to me. I have it on "good authority" that the USPS is not going to put CBU lockers in the Parking lot of the current Post Office. What "authority" is that you ask??? My "good authority" happens to be my mother, who holds the lease with the USPS for the land that the current Post Office operates on. Our family has decided it would not be a good idea to allow the placement of CBU lockers on our land.

It will be interesting to see how Frank/Allison/Victor explain all of this. But I think I have a very plausible explanation. You see, from the very beginning of all this closing process, Frank/Allison/Victor had no idea how they were going to get our mail to us. The record shows that they were adamant about serving our community with rural route service. I was explained to them from the beginning, that the Lodi Community exists partly in Marion County, partly in Cass County. Over the years many of us have tried to get rural route service but were denied, the reason being that no rural route existed in our area. Frank/Allison/Victor had their blinders on, focused on the prize, another successful closure. In order to serve our area with rural route delivery, they would have to extend the Jefferson route to serve the Marion County residents, but in order to serve the Cass County portion of our community, they will have to develop a route out of Bivins. The new Bivins route will have to drive right by the Kildare Post Office to get to the Lodi/Cass County residents. They have ignored this issue from day one. All their cost analysis revolved around Jefferson serving the Lodi people. As their prize draws nearer, they realize they cannot feasibly get our mail to us by rural route service so they jump ship to the only thing they have left - CBU lockers. And even if they do find a place to put up their CBU lockers, will I be wrong in assuming that I will still be entitled to be placed on a rural route. Are they going to be able to force the people of Lodi Community to get their mail in those crappy lockers, or get no mail service at all??????????? The record is wrought with warrant concerning our rural route delivery, yet no provisions are being made to ensure our mail service is ongoing and complete. The only rabbit they could pull out of

A2012-26

A2012-26

the hat was the CBU lockers in the current Post Office parking lot. Oh, they forgot to check with the Landlord. The only communication that our family has had with the USPS concerning the lease is that of October 4, 2011. We received a form letter stating that CBRE would now be handling all USPS lease transactions.

Frank/Allison/Victor have not even tried to understand our unique situation. They see us as little, insignificant people, they could care less about our community. Keep the eye on the prize, Pay-for-performance. What they have put people through is inexcusable, and they had the information in the beginning to make the correct decision. They just ignored it until crunch time. Well, it's crunch time. #19 of the Index is recommendations and service replacement type. You can find a holder for #19 dated 06/10/2011 and signed by Allison Rizan. It states that verification of new service type is complete. That has to be fabricated, because as of today, this very minute, they still do not know how they are going to get our mail to us. Our people have attempted to get on rural route service since all this has progressed and are still being denied. This is because no route exist for service in this area. Not out of Jefferson and not out of Bivins. These people are paper pushers and bullies. Their (Frank/Allison/Victor) actions are tenuous at best, but more likely intentionally mendacious and negligent. This appears to be a sacking of our rights afforded to us by our Constitution.

And speaking of disrespectful, even though this is an non-issue concerning our possible closure, these people have repeatedly used the incorrect date of retirement for our previous Postmaster, Millie Hughes. For the record, Millie Hughes retired on September 30, 2009. This was brought to their attention in more than one instance, early on, but they still show her retirement date as 09/30/2007. Another example of cold/callus, (not kind/caring), behavior.

Allison Rizan states in Item Nbr: 6, Page Nbr: 1, that no photos are available but then Item Nbr: 7 has pages of photos. Which one is it Allison, do you have photos or not???? Maybe as of 06/10/2011 she didn't have them, but the photos have a date stamp on them of 04/28/2011. There is a long time between those two dates, 43 days. There is no attention to detail in this process, and you are using it to take away our Post Office. I think you should have your l's dotted and your t's crossed. Another example of this is Item 22. There are 132 pages that are labeled chronologically, then the following three pages are still under the old heading of Item 38 , pages 1, 2, 3, respectively. These three pages obviously belong to Item 22, not Item 38. Hey, if we can't get them to number their pages correctly, how can we entrust them with the responsibility to make decisions concerning closure of our beloved Post Offices. We can't. These people should not be involved in this process.

A2012-26

Looking at Item Number: 28, Page Number 4, and signed by Victor h Benavides, is a letter to Louie Gohmert. Blah, Blah, Blah, down to the forth paragraph, where Victor states that Frank is planning on installing cluster boxes. This is dated July 15, 2011. Now fast forward to Item Nbr: 38, notice the later date of 08/16/2011. There are numerous responses indicating that we will receive service by rural route carrier. This should indicate that not only are they going to find a place to put up cluster boxes for those that might choose to use them, but they are going to develop two rural routes(one Jefferson for Marion County / one Bivins for Cass County). I will be very interested to see the accounting for that mess.

Their Item Nbr: 1, Page Nbr: 1, dated 04/27/2011, from Frank to Victor, requesting authorization to investigate Lodi, indicates that a zip code change is necessary. But it only includes the Jefferson zip code, which would handle the Marion County portion of the Lodi Community. Item Nbr: 29, Page Nbr: 1, is the proposal check list completed by Allison Rizan. The tenth item on this checklist is the administrative/emanating office, and indicates Jefferson/Bivins. This indicates that at a fairly early date and likely prior to the community meeting, they were aware of our unique situation. Did Frank Richards abide by the policy of 123.622 ZIP Code Assignment, and request changes for both zip codes? He had to have known about it, as it is captured in the record. And if he did do it, was it completed "before" the proposal to discontinue the Post Office was posted?

In Item Nbr: 13, Page Nbr: 1, dated 05/03/2011, just above the name Allison Rizan, she states that "Lodi customers may receive mail by rural delivery." As I am certain the USPS will be reading this, allow me to give you a heads up. Every member of this community that I have spoken to is going to put up a mail box if our Lodi Post Office closes. So get to work on those zip code changes and carrier routes as they will become necessary.

Their Item Nbr: 14, Page Nbr: 1, is sort of funny. We don't have mail boxes that are subject to theft or vandalism. How could there be reports on something that does not exist. We all have as our address the Lodi Post Office. We don't have 911 addresses, we don't have mail boxes. Get it????

Their Item Nbr: 16, Page Nbr: 1, scroll down to #6 at the bottom of page. Even though they have indicated to us that the rural route carriers will be able to assist us with all our needs, this form indicates that "someone else in the community would have to assist these customers." O.K. - again - which one is it????? Can your rural carriers provide us with the maximum degree of effective and regular postal services or do we get assistance elsewhere????? Which one is it???? This theme is also tossed back and forth throughout the record. And I am certain that we have more than 10 special needs customers.

A2012-26

Their Item Nbr: 41, Page Nbr: 1, is "Proposal to close....." (REVISED)
Now that is a new twist for that form. I find no other pages of that same proposal that state they have been "revised". Who revised what and under what authority???????? It is not stamped or dated. I do notice on Page Nbr: 9 of this item that they added a sentence to the first paragraph that is different from the original. I also see "A one-time expense of \$4000 will be incurred for the movement of this facility" has been added under the Economic Savings heading. I suppose they did this in response to the PRC urging the USPS to try to be more realistic with the financial figures they are touting. Since you are the one that signed it, I'll address this to you Frank Richards. I tend to believe the PRC meant to be more forthcoming in the future, going forward. They did not mean to go back and alter the "official record". What good is the official record if can be altered by anyone at anytime. Yes, ya'll have been playing with the record. Did you think no one would notice???? And you have it all "certified" and everything. Just what does it mean to certify a record that has been altered???? It just feels wrong to me.

Their Item Nbr: 47, Page Nbr: 2, which is the "Final determination.....", the very first paragraph indicates that delivery and retail services will be provided by Jefferson Post Office. Service will be provided to cluster boxes. It does not indicate in any way that Bivins will be involved. This is what I deduce from that information. They are going to put up cluster boxes, that a Jefferson rural carrier will service. We will not be offered rural route service. A Jefferson carrier runs out to some boxes, their last stop of the day, throws our mail into the cluster boxes and heads for home. No one I know is going to use the cluster boxes. Can they force this inferior service on us????? I hope not. Save your \$4000 for the cluster boxes (item 15, page 2, 13.(e)) and , if you really see the need to shut us down, we have a right to rural carrier service. Hey, this was your idea, not mine. By the way, that item 15, page2 is another altered document. Is that the same \$4000 you were going to use to move the building, or will that be another \$4000 down the drain?????

By the way, I have two copies of the "original record". One from the Lodi and one from the Jefferson Post Offices. My original is 186 pages that I had to number myself. If you may like to see my original I can mail it to you. Just let me know. Everything that I have stated is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Their Item Nbr:45, Page Nbr: 1, is signed by a new character, one Timothy Vierling, District Manager. It states that they have gone through the motions, completed their checklist, and acted like they cared. He states that the record has been thoroughly reviewed. I wonder if he caught all the discrepancies

A2012-26

in the record that I have??? Mr. Vierling, did you really thoroughly review the record and sign off on it or did you just sign off on it????? Be careful what you say as the record has been altered, and then certified as original. He also states that "effective and regular service will be provided to community residents by permanently implementing the alternative service proposed. Now Timothy, did you choose those words carefully because you could not figure out just what services they were proposing for our community???? I haven't figured it out yet, and I don't think they have, so how can you possibly claim that we are going to receive effective and regular service????? Exactly what is our alternative service going to be Timothy????? I know, you have to say those specific "buzz" words because they are required by law and the PRC believes you when you say them. But that belief is based on credibility, that they afford you, until you lose it. I have seen very little credibility on behalf of the principals during this process and especially shown with inconsistent and altered information throughout the record.

Frank/Allison/Victor, between the three of you, did anyone even take the time to come to Lodi, even for just one half a day, to look around, clock some mileages, to speak with anyone????? I know Frank/Allison came through Lodi to attend the meeting, just as fast as you could get there and get out, but besides that required meeting. Did you come early to see parts of our community other than your travel path to and from the meeting? Did you realize you were in Cass County during the meeting???? Remember - you are closing down a United States Post Office and that "is" a big deal to the people served by that Post Office. Oh, that was not part of your checklist. O.K., I get it.

Since this seems to be all about money, my statement would not be complete without some variation of economic accountability. I notice most of the records for other Post Office closings include statements about over inflating the figures and total annual savings. In our specific case, I would like to submit, as they have, some figures of my own. I'll use their worksheets, pay scales, and formula in this effort. I will be conservative, erring on the side of the USPS when estimates are required.(They don't really deserve it)

They have produced two "distinctly different" rural route carrier estimates, cost for alternative replacement service. One for our record, and one for the PRC record. Our record lists \$7,633.27; the PRC record lists \$6,407.37 as the cost. Let's do some math:

Now, let's rework your numbers on the Rural Route Cost Analysis Form:

We have 81 boxes rented at the Lodi Post Office. There are multiple people who share a box to save expenses. So, I would say that conservatively we will need at least 81 mailboxes, likely more. Additional miles of 7.5 is way too low. Between adding onto the Jefferson route, and bringing in someone from Bivins to run the Cass County aspect of Lodi, they'll be lucky if they get away with 20 miles. This is

A2012-26

extremely conservative. I assume the volume factor is a constant - 1.5

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & \text{Total (additional boxes x volume factor)} & = \underline{121.50} \\ \underline{81 \text{ boxes}} & \times & \underline{2 \text{ min}} & = \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & \text{Total additional box allowance} & \underline{162.00} \\ \text{Additional daily miles } \underline{20.00} & \times & \underline{12 \text{ (mileage standard)}} & = \underline{240.00} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & \text{Total additional minutes per week} & = \underline{523.50} \\ \text{Total annual minutes} & \underline{523.50} & \times \underline{52 \text{ weeks}} & = \underline{27,222.00} \\ \text{Total annual hours} & \underline{27,222.00 \text{ divided by } 60 \text{ min}} & = & \underline{453.70} \\ \text{Rural; Cost per Hour} & = & \underline{37.72} \end{array}$$

$$\text{Total Cost Annually (annual hours } \underline{453.70} \times \text{ cost per hour } \underline{37.72}) = \underline{\$17,113.56}$$

What a difference a day makes!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Remember - those 20miles are an important aspect of this equation and I don't believe they can develop both routes for 20 additional miles. Therefore, this figure is likely to go higher.

Now, if you look at Allison Rizans' checklist, Item Nbr: 29, Page Nbr: 2, under "economic savings", she has some figures. It specifically instructs her to use (EAS-55,minimum,noCOLA). Now, I'm kind of slow, but even I know you can look up all things postal on the internet. Just run a search and come up with the information. That's how I got the salaries listed in the beginning of this statement. All the charts and pay grades are available to anyone who cares to look. So I looked. What did I find??? E-55 minimum is \$25,584. E-55 maximum is \$37,814. Hmmmm.....I think Allison intentionally used the "maximum" when specifically instructed to use the "minimum". Why would she do this?? Better to ask her. It even reminds her on a checkpoint further down - "Is salary based on "minimum" and she checked that one off too. It was important enough to have a reminder further down and she ignored it, just like she has all our concerns. Look under replacement costs and see that she uses \$7,633 This is not the number she has on her most current rural route analysis. Oh.....she forgot to go through the entire record and replace \$7,633 with her newest figure of \$6,407. Who's going to read it anyway and who is going to notice if they do read it???? I did. How sloppy of you Allison. Also on this checklist is a one-time expense that is left blank, because at that time it was not in the works. But her newest record shows \$4000 for this expense.

Does Postmaster salary reflect the current office evaluation? She checked that off as well. Let me share with you the "current" status of our Post Office.

Our OIC salary of 2010	\$18,160.
Fringe benefits	0
Annual lease costs	1,500.
Annual total cost 2010	19,660.

A2012-26

A2012-26

Allison has us pegged down for \$51,982. Big difference in those numbers. I'll assume you want me to finish this math problem for you.

So let's take:

Actual 2010 total costs	\$19,660.
Minus my conservative	
Estimate for replacement service	17,113.
Total annual savings	2547.
Minus revenue from 2010	7,500.
Total annual loss (if closed)	-4,953.
Minus one time expense to move building	4,000.
Total loss	-8,953.
Minus one time expense for CBU lockers	4,000.
Total loss	-12,953.

These folks are losing money faster than they can make it!!!!!!! No wonder they are in such a financial mess. And they are paying Allison \$72,000, Frank \$87,000, and Victor \$163,900 to help them lose it. Someone needs to talk to these folks.....

You can check and cross-check my figures. You will find them to be accurate. The "fuzzy" math they use is deceptive and serves only one purpose; furthering their cause/ pay for performance/ stripping the citizens of Lodi and other communities of their right to maximum postal service.

How can they be so far off on their estimates? Intentionally. It's not that complicated. If you look at some "real" figures, you realize this cannot be about money, as they are actually losing money if they shut down the Lodi Post Office and paying some people a bunch of money to do it. So what is it really about????? We've all seen the figures about saving .7% by closing all the small post offices. That's no help. The only thing that makes any sense to me (with very limited knowledge) is that they are throwing rural America under the bus to get the attention of Congress. I don't know the politics involved but I suppose Congress can help them out of their mess, yet refuses that help. I also believe that they have been handed down the order, to the Frank/Allison/Victor level of management, to cut expenses. Now Frank/Allison/Victor aren't likely to cut themselves out of their piece of the pie, so they look down further to "rural America". They can roll over rural Americans because we will allow it. We'll get up - knock off the dust - and keep on keep'in on. That's how we roll. Shame on the USPS and shame on Congress.

A2012-26

A2012-26

From what I understand, the PRC has no teeth in these matters. But by all means, any assistance you may offer us in dealing with this beast that is the USPS will be greatly appreciated.

Yes, this is going to have a negative effect on our community. Without our zip code they will likely take us off the map. Our Post Office is really all we have. Come see. It will create hardship. I have estimated it will cost \$3,120./year in extra expense to take out a box in Jefferson and visit it 6 days a week as I do our Lodi Post Office.

Yes, it will have a negative impact on employees. They state "there is only one employee and they will be separated". Just one employee, only one, who serves us with the best service any Postmaster has ever given us!!!!

Instead let's separate Allison, just one employee, and save \$72,000/year/not including benefits and bonus. Or let's separate Frank, just one employee, and save \$87,000/year/not including benefits and bonus. Or better yet, let's separate Victor, just one employee, and save \$163,900/year/not including benefits and bonus. None of these people likely ever touch a piece of mail, never wait on a customer. After careful consideration, having weighed all the information, and thoroughly evaluated the situation, I believe it would be in everyone's best interest if we let them all go. With the salaries and benefits that equals a total annual savings of \$429,457. Not including bonuses. And that is true savings. Everyone is "just one employee"!!!!

And for the record, our Post Office is not vacant.....Vacant is what you are trying to make it!!!! I looked up the definition of Postmaster. It can be found in the Postmaster Equality Act of 2003 1004(l)(3). It states, by definition: "Postmaster means an individual who is the Manager in charge of a post office". We have a Postmaster, our office is not vacant, your action is not warranted.

Compliance with government policy to provide maximum degree of service, I think I've covered that. No - they do plan to do this. They still do not know how they are going to get us our mail service.

Economic Savings..... I covered that in detail. No savings - big losses.

Believe me, I could go on. But I think I gave you a lot of good information. There's nothing good about what is going on. Even beyond that, I believe there is actually bad in this situation. Your should review every case that Frank/Allison/Victor have sent through your system. I doubt they just did this to the Lodi Community.

A2012-26

A2012-20

Thank you so very much, for allowing me a chance to try to right this terrible wrong that has been a heavy burden for my community.

Very Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tammy Cornett". The signature is fluid and elegant, with a long horizontal flourish extending from the end of the name.

Tammy Cornett

A2012-26

Post Office Survey Sheet *(continued)*

Docket 1370779 - 75561

Page Nbr 15

Page Nbr 2

10.	What equipment in the Post Office is not owned by the Postal Service (e.g., Post Office Boxes, furniture, safe)? <u>Refrigerator couch telephone toaster</u>
11.	List potential CBU/parcel lockers sites and distances from present Post Office site. <u>Parking lot of the current Post Office and</u>
12.	Are there any special customer needs? (People who cannot read or write, who cannot drive, who have infirmities or physical handicaps, etc.) How can these people be accommodated? <u>10 customers that can not read or write. PMR regularly fills out money orders for these customers. Disabled customers will have to assisted by neighbors or relatives.</u>
13.	<p>Rural delivery/HCR delivery.</p> <p>a. What is current evaluation? <u>48:57</u></p> <p>b. Will this change result in the route being overburdened? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If so, what accommodations will be made to adjust the route? _____</p> <p>c. How many boxes and miles will be added to the route? <u>64, box 3.00 Miles</u></p> <p>d. What would be the additional annual expense if the route is increased? <u>7633</u></p> <p>e. What is the one-time cost of CBU/parcel locker installation (if appropriate)? <u>4000</u></p> <p>f. At what time of the day does the carrier begin delivery to the community? <u>3:30</u></p> <p>Will this delivery time be affected if the office is discontinued? (Y or N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If so, how? <u>It will be later.</u></p>
14.	<p>Are the Post Office box fees at the facility that will provide alternative service different from those at the office to be discontinued? If so, how (Cost)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> More <input type="checkbox"/> Same <input type="checkbox"/> Less</p> <p><u>Jefferson #1 - 46.00 #2 - 70.00 #3 - 110.00 #4 - 220.00 #5- 0410.00 Kildare is 5.10 miles away and the box rate is the same as Lodi.</u></p>

A2012-26

Post Office Survey Sheet(continued)

Docket: 1370779 - 75564

Page Nbr: 15

Page Nbr: 2

10.	What equipment in the Post Office is not owned by the Postal Service (e.g., Post Office Boxes, furniture, safe)? <u>Refrigerator couch telephone toaster</u>
11.	List potential CBU/parcel lockers sites and distances from present Post Office site. <u>None</u>
12.	Are there any special customer needs? (People who cannot read or write, who cannot drive, who have infirmities or physical handicaps, etc.) How can these people be accommodated? <u>10 customers that can not read or write. PMR regularly fills out money orders for these customers. Disabled customers will have to assisted by neighbors or relatives.</u>
13.	<p>Rural delivery/HCR delivery.</p> <p>a. What is current evaluation? <u>48:57</u></p> <p>b. Will this change result in the route being overburdened? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If so, what accommodations will be made to adjust the route? _____</p> <p>c. How many boxes and miles will be added to the route? <u>41, box 7.50 Miles</u></p> <p>d. What would be the additional annual expense if the route is increased? <u>7633</u></p> <p>e. What is the one-time cost of CBU/parcel locker installation (id appropriate)? <u>0</u></p> <p>f. At what time of the day does the carrier begin delivery to the community? <u>3:30</u></p> <p>Will this delivery time be affected if the office is discontinued? (Y or N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If so, how? <u>It will be later.</u></p>
14.	<p>Are the Post Office box fees at the facility that will provide alternative service different from those at the office to be discontinued? If so, how (Cost)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> More <input type="checkbox"/> Same <input type="checkbox"/> Less</p> <p><u>Jefferson: #1 - 46.00 #2 - 70.00 #3 - 110.00 #4 - 220.00 #5 - 0410.00 Kildare is 5.10 miles away and the box rate is the same as Lodi.</u></p>

A2012-26

Rural Route Cost Analysis Form

Docket: 1370779 - 75564

Item Nbr: 17

Page Nbr: 2

Rural Route Carrier
Estimated Cost for Alternative Replacement Service

Office Name: LODIOffice Zip+4: 75564 -9998District: DALLAS PFC

1. Enter the number of additional boxes to be added to the rural route

41

2. Enter the number of additional miles to be added to the route
 Enter the volume factor

7.501.50

Total (additional boxes x volume factor) 61.50

3. Enter the number of additional boxes to be added to the rural route

41

Centralized boxes

0.00

x 1.00 Min

0.00

Regular L route boxes

0.00

x 1.82 Min

0.00

Regular Non-L route boxes

41.00

x 2.00 Min

82.00

Total additional box allowance 82.00

4. Enter the number of additional daily miles to be added to the rural route

7.50

x 12 Mileage Standard

90.00

Total additional minutes per week
 (miles carried to two decimal places) 233.50

5. Total additional annual minutes (additional minutes per week year)

233.50

x 52 Weeks

12,142.00

6. Total additional annual hours (additional annual minutes/ 60 minutes per hour)

12,142.00

/ 60 Minutes

202.37

7. Enter the rural cost per hour (see national payroll summary report - rural carrier, consolidated)

37.72

Total Annual Cost (additional annual hours x rural cost per hour) 7,633.27

8. Enter lock pouch allowance (if applicable)

0.00

Total annual cost for alternate service (annual cost minus lock pouch allowance) 7,633.27

A2012-26

Rural Route Cost Analysis Form

Docket 1370779 - 75564

Item Nbr 17

Page Nbr 2

Rural Route Carrier Estimated Cost for Alternative Replacement Service

Office Name	<u>LODI</u>		
Office Zip+4	<u>75564 -9998</u>	District	<u>DALLAS PFC</u>
1. Enter the number of additional boxes to be added to the rural route	<u>64</u>		
2. Enter the number of additional miles to be added to the route	<u>3.00</u>		
Enter the volume factor	<u>1.50</u>		
Total (additional boxes x volume factor)			<u>96.00</u>
3. Enter the number of additional boxes to be added to the rural route	<u>64</u>		
Centralized boxes	<u>64.00</u>	x 1.00 Min	<u>64.00</u>
Regular L route boxes	<u>0.00</u>	x 1.82 Min	<u>0.00</u>
Regular Non-L route boxes	<u>0.00</u>	x 2.00 Min	<u>0.00</u>
Total additional box allowance			<u>64.00</u>
4. Enter the number of additional daily miles to be added to the rural route	<u>3.00</u>	x 12 Mileage Standard	<u>36.00</u>
Total additional minutes per week (miles carried to two decimal places)			<u>196.00</u>
5. Total additional annual minutes (additional minutes per week year)	<u>196.00</u>	x 52 Weeks	<u>10,192.00</u>
6. Total additional annual hours (additional annual minutes/ 60 minutes per hour)	<u>10,192.00</u>	/ 60 Minutes	<u>169.87</u>
7. Enter the rural cost per hour (see national payroll summary report - rural carrier, consolidated)	<u>37.72</u>		
Total Annual Cost (additional annual hours x rural cost per hour)			<u>6,407.37</u>
8. Enter lock pouch allowance (if applicable)			<u>0.00</u>
Total annual cost for alternate service (annual cost minus lock pouch allowance)			<u>6,407.37</u>

A2012-26